



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : James Crawford

Art Unit : 2141

Serial No. : 09/597,784

Examiner : Kristie D Shingles

Filed : June 19, 2000

Title : DIRECT FILE TRANSFER BETWEEN SUBSCRIBERS OF A
COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

MAIL STOP AF

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Do Not Enter
-KDS 9/14/05

REPLY TO ADVISORY ACTION OF AUGUST 8, 2005

Claims 1-40 and 45-64 are pending in this application with claims 1, 14, 29, 30, 31, 36 and 45 being independent.

Applicants submit the following remarks in the interest of advancing prosecution and clarifying issues for appeal.

In the reply to the Office Action of May 3, 2005, applicants asserted that neither Hutton, Haumont, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests the operation of sending, through the communications system host, a request to establish a direct connection with the second client and establishing a direct connection that bypasses the communications system host *if a user of the second client accepts the request*. In the Advisory Action of August 8, 2005, the Examiner stated:

Applicant argues, in substance, that cited prior art reference Hutton et al (USPN 6,513,066) does not teach a user of a second client device accepting a request for establishing a direct connection to the first client device. Examiner respectfully disagrees, Hutton et al indicates in Figure 2 the establishment of direct communication between the first and second client. Furthermore, in col. 7, lines 2-22 and col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 45, Hutton et al discloses point-to-point communication between the first and second users bypassing the mail server. Therefore, Applicants arguments is non-persuasive.

Page 2 of Advisory Action of August 8, 2005. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's response to applicant's argument is not responsive in that it does not address the recited limitation that *user* acceptance of a direct connection request is necessary for establishment of the direct connection between a first and a second client.

The Examiner asserts that Hutton discloses in Figure 2 the establishment of direct communication between the first and second clients. Applicants do not refute this. Applicants